

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated December 26, 2002. Claims 1-94 are presented for examination, of which Claims 1, 10, 20, 41, 50, 60, 93, and 94 are in independent form. Claims 1-6, 10, 12-15, 17-20, 22-26, 31, 33-36, 38-45, 50, 52-55, 57-60, 62-65, 71, 73-76, and 78-94 have been amended as to formal matters and for reasons related to their rejections. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

As an initial matter, Applicant respectfully requests acknowledgment that "all" the certified copies of the priority documents for this application have been received. (In the Office Action Summary, no indication is given as to whether: a) all; b) some; or c) none of the priority documents have been received.)

The Office Action rejected Claims 1-94 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,356,937 (Montville et al.). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections, and submits that independent Claims 1, 10, 20, 41, 50, 60, 93, and 94, together with the claims dependent thereon, are patentably distinct from Montville et al. for at least the following reasons.

Applicant notes that the present invention claims priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 of Japanese Application No. 11-054626, filed on March 2, 1999, and Japanese Application No. 2000-049691, filed on February 25, 2000. Certified copies of the priority documents have already been submitted.

Claims 1-7, 10-13, 16-27, 29-34, 37-47, 50-53, 56-67, 69-74, and 77-94, which includes all the independent claims, are supported by the disclosure of Japanese Application No.

11-054626 ("the '626 application"). In order to perfect Applicant's claim for foreign priority, a sworn English translation of the '626 application is presently being prepared and will be submitted as soon as it is completed. Accordingly, with the sworn translation, Applicant submits that Claims 1-7, 10-13, 16-27, 29-34, 37-47, 50-53, 56-67, 69-74, and 77-94 are entitled to the benefit of the priority date of March 2, 1999. Therefore, Montville et al., which has a filing date of July 6, 1999, does not qualify as prior art to those claims.

The other rejected claims in this application depend from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and, therefore, are submitted to be patentable for at least the same reasons.

Additionally, Claims 9, 14, 15, 35, 36, 49, 54, 55, 75, and 76 include a feature of managing attached objects based on their versions. Also, Claims 8, 28, 48, and 68 include a feature of managing attached objects based on storage area (document folder). (See page 24, line 20, to page 25, line 25, of the present specification.) Montville et al. is understood to relate to management of e-mail data, but fails to teach or suggest management of an object to be attached to an e-mail. That is, Montville et al. fails to teach or suggest management of objects to be attached to e-mails based on their version information or their storage area. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 8, 9, 14, 15, 28, 35, 36, 48, 49, 54, 55, 68, 75, and 76 are not obvious in view of Montville et al.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application.

No petition to extend the time for response to the Office Action is deemed

necessary for the present Amendment. If, however, such a petition is required to make this Amendment timely filed, then this paper should be considered such a petition and the Commissioner is authorized to charge the requisite petition fee to Deposit Account 06-1205.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant
Lock, Seelye & JAHNES
Registration No. 38,667

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY_MAIN 317971v1